

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 11, 2007.

Currently, claims 1-53 are pending. Applicants have amended claims 1-33 and 35-50 and added new claims 51-53. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-53.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-50 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Taylor (US 7,013,431). Because Taylor does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1-50, Applicants assert that the claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Taylor because Taylor does not disclose “automatically changing a display of said second software program application in response to said changing of said display of said first software program application.”

Taylor discloses an end user interface (EUI) that allows resizing and re-positioning. However, the windows that are resized and re-positioned are **not** “applications,” as suggested by the Examiner. Instead, they are simply views of different types of content, “such as video 308a-308e, graphics 310a-310b and texts 312a-312c” (see Fig. 3 and col. 6, lines 43-45). Taylor also uses the example of using the disclosed EUI for the presentation of “one or more performance or live events, such as sporting events, where the multiple windows are employed to present different views of each performance or event to the end user” (col. 4, lines 28-31).

As stated in the Specification, “an application is defined as any stand-alone piece of functionality that can be viewed, modified, or interacts with a set of data” (p. 7, paragraph [0028]). Additionally, Merriam-Webster’s online dictionary defines an application as “a program (as a word processor or a spreadsheet) that performs one of the major tasks for which a computer is used.” The windows disclosed in Taylor are simply used to display content such as video, graphics, or text and do not have any independent functionality. Therefore, the disclosed windows are not “applications.” The only element in Taylor with any sort of stand-alone functionality is the entire EUI itself, which includes the windows. Because Taylor does not disclose “a set of software program applications,” as described in claim 1, the reference does not

anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-50 are distinguishable over the prior art for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims.

New claim 51 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claim 51 is patentable over Taylor because Taylor does not disclose the described "server." Applicants respectfully request consideration of this claim.

New claims 52 and 53 are also patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claims 52 and 53 are patentable over Taylor because Taylor does not disclose displaying the applications "within a web browser." Applicants respectfully request consideration of these claims.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 1-53 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, May 25, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2007

By: /Michelle Esteban/
Michelle Esteban
Reg. No. 59,880

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP
575 Market Street, Suite 2500
San Francisco, California 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665